UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,925	08/30/2001	Robert Frost	1093/50057	6316

7590 07/25/2005

CROWELL & MORING, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300

EXAMINER	
JASTRZAB, KRISANNE MARIE	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1744	

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/941,925	FROST ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Krisanne Jastrzab	1744	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 May 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,6,8,9,11,13,14,16,18 and 19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,6,8,9,11,13-14,16,18 and 19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-9, 11-14, 16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The use of "abruptly" and "shortest possible time" recited in claims 1 and 16, is found to be vague and indefinite because the terms are relative terms which render the claim indefinite. The terms are not defined by the claims, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Those claims not specifically referred to, are included in this rejection because they depend from claims containing rejected subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Cummings et al., U.S. patent No. 4,952,370.

Cummings et al., teach sterilization of the surfaces of a chamber wherein a combination of steam and hydrogen peroxide is created in a vaporizer, the combination is sent to the chamber to be sterilized and then condensed on the surfaces being treated. A vacuum is drawn to remove the condensate by evacuation. The vacuum is set such that the water vapor will removed first to enhance contact of the hydrogen peroxide. The steps of the process are repeated with the introduction of the hydrogen peroxide/steam combination occurring in a plurality of injections. See column 2, lines 40-53, column 3, lines 40-68, column 4, lines 45-62, column 5, lines 20-30, column 6, lines 1-5, 12-16, 20-25, 33-50 and 65-68, and column 7, lines 1-5.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16, and 18-19 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of copending Application No. 10/363,546. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are of the same inventive concept, namely, sterilization by the application of steam and hydrogen peroxide such that they

condense onto the surface being sterilized, with removal thereof by drawing a vacuum, differentiated only by '546 claiming placement of the object in a known and well recognized sterilization wrap or bag such that the condensation takes place within the bag.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16, and 18-19 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No. 10/759,071. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are of the same inventive concept, namely, sterilization by the application of steam and hydrogen peroxide such that they condense onto the surface being sterilized, with removal thereof by drawing a vacuum, differentiated only in that '071 specifies that the sterilization chamber be constructed of non-heat conducting materials which is intrinsic to the process requiring condensation of the sterilant onto those surfaces.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16, and 18-19 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of copending Application No. 10/806,292. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are of the same inventive concept, namely, sterilization by the application of steam and hydrogen peroxide such that they condense onto the surface being sterilized, with removal thereof by drawing a vacuum,

differentiated only by '292 claiming pre-heating of surfaces in the treatment area, a well recognized step in processes employing the injection of a previously vaporized sterilant in order to ensure that the sterilant reaches the entire area before condensing.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/2/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the process of Cummings is long and complicated and as such, does not meet the claimed limitation of "abruptly releasing" the hydrogen peroxide/steam vapor into the chamber, however, the Examiner would disagree and maintain that the teachings of Cummings, namely, the introduction of the vapor into a pre-evacuated sterilization chamber and achieving the instantly claimed condensation of the vapor, does meet the "abruptly releasing" and "shortest possible time" limitations as they have not been defined in a manner to exclude the teachings of Cummings.

Applicant also argues that the outstanding obviousness-type double patenting rejections are not proper. Applicant argues that the application of super-heated hydrogen peroxide in '546 is a non-obvious differentiation from the instant claims, however the Examiner would maintain that the same steps are being performed such that the condensation of the instant claims, taking place within the sterilization wrap or bag of the '546 claims and that the provision of sterilization wraps and bags is well recognized as conventional in the art. Applicant argues that the provision

of low heat conducting materials of construction as claimed in '071 is a non-obvious differentiation over the instant claims, however, the Examiner would continue to maintain that the choice of such materials would be intrinsic to the process to achieve the claimed sterilization in the claimed sterilization environment. Applicant finally argues that the secondary pre-heating step/means of '292 is a non-obvious differentiation over the instant claims, however, the Examiner would disagree and maintain that pre-heating of surfaces in the treatment area, is a well recognized step in processes employing the injection of a previously vaporized sterilant in order to ensure that the sterilant reaches the entire area before condensing. These rejections are deemed proper and maintained.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krisanne Jastrzab whose telephone number is 571-272-1279. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Wed. 6:30am-4:00pm and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Kim can be reached on 571-272-1142. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Krisanne Jastrzab
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1744

July 21, 2005